

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHERN DIVISION

JOSEPH EVAN TILLERY, #278 636,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:18-CV-989-WHA
)	[WO]
COVINGTON COUNTY, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Plaintiff, an inmate incarcerated at the Alabama Therapeutic Education Facility filed this action on November 26, 2018, seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed an affidavit in support of a motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The motion, however, did not include the required documentation from the inmate account clerk. The court, therefore, did not have the information necessary to determine whether Plaintiff should be allowed to proceed *in forma pauperis* in this case and entered an order on November 30, 2018, requiring Plaintiff to provide the court with this information on or before December 14, 2018. Doc. 3. The court specifically cautioned Plaintiff that failure to comply with the November 30 order would result in a recommendation that this case be dismissed. *Id.*

The requisite time has passed and Plaintiff has not complied with the court's November 30, 2018, order. The court, therefore, concludes that this case is due to be dismissed. *Moon v. Newsome*, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989) (As a general rule, where a litigant has been forewarned, dismissal for failure to obey a court order is not an abuse of discretion.); *see also Tanner v. Neal*, 232 Fed. Appx. 924 (11th Cir. 2007) (affirming *sua sponte* dismissal without

prejudice of inmate's § 1983 action for failure to file an amended complaint in compliance with court's prior order directing amendment and warning of consequences for failure to comply).

Accordingly, it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge this case be DISMISSED without prejudice for Plaintiff's failures to comply with the order of the court and to prosecute this action.

It is ORDERED that **on or before February 7, 2019**, Plaintiff may file an objection to this Recommendation. Any objection filed must specifically identify the factual findings and legal conclusions in the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation to which Plaintiff objects. Frivolous, conclusive or general objections will not be considered by the District Court.

Failure to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations in the Magistrate Judge's report shall bar a party from a *de novo* determination by the District Court of factual findings and legal issues covered in the report and shall "waive the right to challenge on appeal the district court's order based on unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions" except upon grounds of plain error if necessary in the interests of justice. 11th Cir. R. 3-1; *see Resolution Trust Co. v. Hallmark Builders, Inc.*, 996 F.2d 1144, 1149 (11th Cir. 1993); *Henley v. Johnson*, 885 F.2d 790, 794 (11th Cir. 1989).

Done this 24th day of January, 2019

/s/Charles S. Coody

CHARLES S. COODY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE